



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/714,712	11/17/2003	Michael D. Gallant	03-1040 1496.00344	2328

24319 7590 03/28/2007  
LSI LOGIC CORPORATION  
1621 BARBER LANE  
MS: D-106  
MILPITAS, CA 95035

EXAMINER
----------

WERNER, DAVID N

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2621

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	03/28/2007	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/714,712	<b>Applicant(s)</b> GALLANT ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> David N. Werner	<b>Art Unit</b> 2621	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

**A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.**

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.  
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some    \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                      |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>20031117, 20051027</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____  |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Drawings***

1. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the search for a third motion vector for a first current block must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Art Unit: 2621

2. The drawings are objected to because in figure 3, the word "GLOBAL" is misspelled as "GOLBAL" in block 142 and block 146. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the examiner does not accept the changes, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

### ***Specification***

3. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: in page 1, line 9 and page 15, line 4, a co-pending related application is not properly identified, and in page 10, line 4, the word "copied" is misspelled as "coped".

Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

4. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention lacks patentable utility. Although the specification discloses circuitry for determining motion vectors (page 19, lines 12-14), the invention only claims *searching* for motion vectors without actually generating a motion vector or producing an output with a calculated motion vector. Therefore, claims 1-19 are directed toward mere mathematical manipulation of data, which lacks a useful, concrete, and tangible result. See *State Street*, 149 F.3d at 1373, 47 USPQ2d at 1601-1602. Compare with claim 20, which invokes 35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph, and so encompasses mode decision tree circuit 202, as disclosed in the specification of the present invention, which determines motion vectors (page 19, lines 12-14).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 1 and 11-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US Patent 6,473,460 B1 (Topper). Topper teaches a motion estimation system based

Art Unit: 2621

on first and second overlapping pixel blocks. Regarding claim 1, figure 2A shows three sets of overlapping blocks: first block set 212, second block set 214, horizontally offset from first block set 212 by four pixels, and third block set 216, vertically offset from first block set 212 by four pixels (column 3, line 65 – page 4, line 17). These block sets comprise blocks of eight by eight pixels, such as block 218 in first block set 212 and block 310 in second block set 214 (column 4, lines 51-54). Motion estimation processor 114 generates motion vector 222 for block 218, and applies it to sub-block 220, which is centrally located in block 218 and is of size four by four pixels (column 4, lines 25-31). The motion vector is searched over a displacement from 1 to 6 pixels from block 218 in the horizontal and vertical directions (column 4, lines 36-40). Motion estimation processor 114 then generates motion vector 314 for block 310, and applies it to sub-block 312, which is centrally located in block 310 and is of size four by four pixels. Motion estimation vector 114 takes reference values from prior field memory 112 (column 2, lines 64-67). Then, for first current block 220, processor 114 searches for first motion vector 222 from reference pixels in and adjacent to block 218, copies more reference samples from prior field memory 112, and searches for second motion vector 314 among block 310, copied from prior memory 112. Since block 218 and block 310 overlap over a strip of 4 by 8 pixels (figure 3B), second reference block 310 contains a portion of pixels that are also in first reference block 218.

Regarding claim 11, figure 6 shows the method performed by the apparatus of Topper. Regarding claim 12, motion processor 114 receives video information from prior field memory 112 before generating motion vectors for the current field (column 2,

Art Unit: 2621

line 67 – column 3, line 2). Regarding claim 13, figure 3B shows block 312 adjacent to block 220, and regarding claim 14, reference block 310 contains pixels also in block 218, as well as pixels not in, but adjoining, block 218. Regarding claim 15, each time a new field is received in current field memory 110, the previous field is transferred to prior field memory 112 (column 2, lines 62-64).

Regarding claim 16, the process of calculating a motion vector to the right of a given block is repeated for the entire width of an image (column 4, lines 65-66). Once motion vectors are calculated for a row of blocks in the manner described above, a motion vector is calculated for block 410, displaced four pixels below block 218. This motion vector is applied to sub-block 412, which adjoins sub-block 220, as illustrated in figure 4B. Block 410 is part of third block set 216. For each row of blocks, the motion vector of a block beneath a current block is calculated (column 5, lines 14-28). Since this is an iterative row-by-row process, old reference blocks may be dropped as needed. Regarding claim 17, a four-by-four current block is central to a 20-by-20 first reference block, that is, an eight-by-eight block with additional displacement of up to six pixels horizontally or vertically in each direction (column 4, lines 36-40). Regarding claim 18, the second reference block is displaced by a distance of four pixels to the right of the first reference block, and the third reference block is displaced by a distance of four pixels down from the first reference block.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 2-9 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Topper, in view of US Patent 6,380,986 B1 (Minami et al.), cited in the Information Disclosure Statement of 27 October 2005.

Claim 2 of the present invention differs from Topper, in that the present invention encompasses a search memory as part of a motion vector search circuit, and Topper does not disclose this feature. Minami et al. discloses a method for obtaining a motion vector by matching a target block and a set of blocks each having the same size as the template. Figure 16 of Minami et al. discloses a "conventional" motion vector search apparatus (column 6, lines 66-67) with a search memory. Figure 16 shows search area memory 23 as part of motion vector search apparatus 20. Regarding claim 2, an arrow from search area memory 23 to processing device 21 indicates that the search memory can be read from, and an arrow from image memory 24 to search area memory 23 indicates that the search memory can be written to. In Minami et al., template memory 22 contains a block that is to be matched, and search area memory 23 contains the search area for the block (column 4, lines 51-55). Regarding claims 4-6, figure 1A of Topper shows controller 118 that controls the memories and motion estimation processor of Topper. Claim 20 of the present invention is in proper means-plus-function



format, and invokes 35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph. Then, the "means for searching" motion vectors and "means for copying" reference samples from an external memory will be limited to a motion estimation processor circuit with a search memory and a control system, as described in the specification and shown in figure 4 of the present invention. Regarding claim 20, the motion estimation circuit and controller of Topper, combined with the search area memory of Minami et al., and the external memory of either prior invention, fully encompass the subject matter of claim 20.

Topper discloses the claimed invention except for a search memory in a motion estimation circuit. Minami et al. teaches that it is known to provide a search area memory in a motion vector search apparatus. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add a search memory to a motion estimation apparatus as taught by Minami et al., since Minami et al states in column 4, lines 23-29 that such a modification would facilitate higher-speed data transfer within the motion estimation apparatus than between the apparatus and an external memory.

Claim 3 of the present invention differs from Topper in that in the present invention, the search memory stores an array of at least 96 by 48 pixels, and in Topper, the search window for a block is 20 by 20 pixels. Claim 7 of the present invention differs from Topper in that in the present invention, a column of reference blocks are copied from the external memory, and in Topper, only one block is searched at a time. Claim 8 of the present invention further limits the column to a 1-by-3 column. However, figure 17 of Minami et al. shows a slice technique in which an image is divided into

Art Unit: 2621

vertical slices, and subdivided into horizontal strips of the same width of a template block (column 4, lines 42-45). This technique is performed using the previously discussed apparatus of figure 16. Regarding claim 3, figure 17 shows search areas 29 and 30 to be of arbitrary size: larger than blocks 27 and 28, but smaller than image 25. Regarding claims 7 and 8, figure 17 shows newly searched area 31 as a column of blocks. Regarding claim 9, newly searched area 31 is adjacent to search area 30, already stored in a search memory (column 4, lines 57-61).

Topper discloses the invention of claim 7 and claim 9 except for refreshing the search range of a motion vector for a block in a column adjoining the previously searched area. Minami et al. teaches that it is known to divide an image into blocks and successively search among a plurality of blocks. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to successively search for a motion vector from left to right columns as taught by Minami et al., since Minami et al. states in column 4, lines 61-67 that such a modification would save redundant transfer of pixels into a search memory. Furthermore, the combination of Topper and Minami et al. discloses the invention of claim 3 and claim 8 except for the specification of a search window to be at least 96 by 48 pixels and the specification of a column copied from a memory to be a 1 by 3 array of blocks. However, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to specify the dimensions of search areas, since such a modification would have involved a mere change in the size of a component, which is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Rose*, 105 USPQ 237 (CCPA 1955).

8. Claims 10 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Topper in view of US Patent Application Publication 2002/0176500 A1 (Bakhmutsky et al). Topper discloses a system for finding motion vectors in which motion vectors are searched using three reference sets. The present invention differs from Topper in that in the present invention, two reference sets are used to search for motion vectors for the same block, and in Topper, each reference set is used to search for a motion vector in a different block. Bakhmutsky et al. teaches a system for field prediction motion estimation. In Bakhmutsky et al., a 16 by 16 macroblock is divided into two portions, and each portion is searched in the top field of a reference picture and the bottom field of a reference picture [0016]. Thus, four searches are done in parallel. The resultant motion vector for the macroblock is the one that generates the least error. Regarding claim 10, figure 3 shows an apparatus with four parallel search engines that each generate an error metric for the top field or bottom field of a macroblock in the top or bottom field of an anchor picture [0038]. A series of logic elements produces the best match for each search engine, and the chosen motion vector for the macroblock is the best match according to the top field, the bottom field, and the whole frame. Regarding claim 19, figure 2 shows a block diagram for the method of motion estimation using field prediction.

Topper discloses the claimed invention except for searching for a motion vector for a block in two reference sets. Bakhmutsky et al. teaches that it was known to search for a motion vector for a block in the top field and the bottom field of the image.

Art Unit: 2621

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to perform multiple parallel searches for different fields as taught by Bakhmutsky et al., since Bakhmutsky et al. states in paragraph [0016] that such a modification would allow a plurality of motion estimation modes to be performed concurrently.

### ***Conclusion***

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

- US Patent 6,359,921 B1 (Boon)
- US Patent 6,272,179 B1 (Kadono)
- US Patent 6,215,822 B1 (Bose et al.)
- US Patent 6,108,040 A (Moteki et al.)

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David N. Werner whose telephone number is (571) 272-9662. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mehrdad Dastouri can be reached on (571) 272-7418. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2621

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

DNW

*Mehrdad Dastouri*  
MEHRDAD DASTOURI  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TC 2600